UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/738,463	12/17/2003	Ernst-Wilhelm Schubert	71128	9591
23872 MCGLEW & T	7590 02/21/200 UTTLE, PC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION			KOHARSKI, CHRISTOPHER	
	GH, NY 10510-9227		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/738,463	SCHUBERT ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	CHRISTOPHER D. KOHARSKI	3763
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 N</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the practice of the practice o	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1,3-6 and 8-19 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) 14-19 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1, 3-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Seetion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/738,463 Page 2

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/21/2007 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Examiner acknowledges the reply filed 11/21/2007 in which claims 1, 4, 6, 11, and 14 were amended and amendments to the specification were made. Currently claims 1, 3-6 and 8-19 are pending for examination in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

or

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Page 3

Art Unit: 3763

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Morris et al. (USPN7,150,724). Morris et al. discloses a syringe plunger driver system.

Regarding claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, and 11-13, Morris et al. discloses a medical active ingredient dispensing system (Figure 12), comprising: a supply line (74) leading to a patient; a module (30) with a base part (34) having a coupler including a first side coupler part and a second side coupler part (154) for receiving and sending electricity and data for series connection with a base part having a coupler (54) of another adjacent module (30), and a cartridge (36) with a fluid interface (32) connectable for connection to the supply line leading to the patient, said cartridge for receiving and holding a medical active ingredient and including a detachable delivery device (52) comprising a micropump syringe (44) delivering the medical active ingredient from said cartridge to said fluid interface, said base part having a cartridge holding means (38, 42) for accommodating said cartridge and positioning said fluid interface relative to said base and the supply line; and another module (30) with a base part (34) having a coupler including a first side coupler part (154) and a second side coupler part (154) for

Art Unit: 3763

receiving and sending electricity and data for series connection with a base part having a coupler of another adjacent module, and a cartridge (36) with a fluid interface (32) connectable for connection to the supply line leading to the patient, said cartridge for receiving and holding a medical active ingredient and including a delivery device delivering the medical active ingredient from said cartridge to said fluid interface (Figures 1-12, cols 1-2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 4 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al. (USPN7,150,724) in view of Prendergast (USPN5,873,731). Morris et al. meets the claim limitations as described above except for a code means for passing medical active ingredient information.

However, Prendergast teaches a patient drug recognition system.

Application/Control Number: 10/738,463 Page 5

Art Unit: 3763

Regarding claims 4 and 9-10, Prendergast discloses a device (6) for dispensing medical active ingredients comprising a micropump (140, 142, 144) with a computer controller (31) (col 8, ln 50-60) for evaluating data and controlling the micropumps, with multiple modules with an upper and lower parts (near 132, 134, 136) with a coupling means and coupling receiving part (135, 164) capable of being coupled to an adjacent module and in series with a guiding structure (Figure 4), and a code means for passing medical information and electrical signals (82, 84) (col 6, ln 25-60) (Figures 5-6b) including pins (90) (Figures 1-8).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to add the code passing information system of Prendergast to the system of Morris et al. in order to allow for accurate medical agent delivery and prevent user error. The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Prendergast (cols 1-2).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14-19 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-6 and 8-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Page 6 Application/Control Number: 10/738,463

Art Unit: 3763

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Koharski whose telephone number is 571-272-7230. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30am to 2:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Date: 2/5/2008

/Christopher D Koharski/ Examiner, Art Unit 3763

/Nicholas D Lucchesi/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3763